



City of Somerville

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

City Hall 3rd Floor, 93 Highland Avenue, Somerville MA 02143

DECEMBER 14, 2021, MEETING NOTES

This meeting was conducted via remote participation on GoToWebinar.

NAME	TITLE	STATUS
Sarah Lewis	Co-Chair	<i>Present</i>
Cortney Kirk	Acting Co-Chair	<i>Present</i>
Frank Valdes	Member	<i>Present</i>
Deborah Fennick	Member	<i>Present</i>
Andrew Arbaugh	Member	<i>Present</i>
Tim Talun	Member	<i>Present</i>

City staff present: Andrew Graminski (Planning & Zoning)

The meeting was called to order at 6:07pm and adjourned at 8:07pm.

GENERAL BUSINESS: Meeting Minutes Approval

Following a motion by Member Fennick, seconded by Member Talun, the Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to approve the minutes from October 26, 2021 with the edits proposed by Member Talun.

PUBLIC MEETING: 45 Broadway (P&Z 21-035)

Member Arbaugh recused himself.

Due to the project not meeting a zoning standard, Co-Chair Lewis recommended that the project be continued until the revisions are made.

Following a motion by Member Valdes, seconded by Member Fennick, the Commission voted unanimously (3-0) to continue the design review to a future meeting.

RESULT:

CONTINUED

PUBLIC MEETING: 51 Broadway (P&Z 21-034)

Due to the project not meeting a zoning standard, Co-Chair Lewis recommended that the project be continued until the revisions are made.

Following a motion by Member Valdes, seconded by Member Fennick, the Commission voted unanimously (3-0) to continue the design review to a future meeting.

RESULT:

CONTINUED

PUBLIC MEETING: 350 Assembly Row (P&Z 21-137)

(continued from 23 November 2021)

The applicant team presented updated designs with incorporation from previous design review. Two major changes included reexamining the penthouse scale and storefront design. The penthouse redesigned to appear as “two” floors. They also reviewed the updated materiality.

The Commission and applicant team discussed the balcony location, outdoor amenity space at penthouse level, the mechanical components that will protrude above the 158’ of the penthouse, the lighting plan including the UDC’s request to not light the penthouse, the possibility of altering the setback or design of the penthouse, the materiality of the penthouse and overall building, and how to incorporate ground story design and create dynamic corners that fit within the neighborhood.

Following a motion by Member Valdes, seconded by Member Talun, the Commission voted unanimously (3-0) to recommend the schematic design.

Following a motion by Member Valdes, seconded by Member Fennick, the Commission voted unanimously (3-0) that the design guidelines have been met.

Following a motion by Member Talun, seconded by Member Valdes, the Commission voted unanimously (3-0) to incorporate additional design guidance such as additional setbacks at the penthouse, the storefronts will be reviewed and approved separately, the corners will be redesigned, the penthouse will not be lit, and to recommend to the Planning Board that an onsite material mockup is created during the construction phase.

RESULT:

RECOMMENDED

PUBLIC MEETING: 96-100 Broadway

(continued from 23 November 2021)

Member Arbaugh rejoined the meeting.

The applicant team gave a quick overview of the project and then presented the landscaping plan, as well as the façade options. All three previous façade options were redesigned.

The Commission and applicant team discussed the passive house requirements, current street trees and the possibility of adding more, the landscaping plan and how the UDC encourages the team to select a stronger diversity of plant species and permeable pavers, the building exhaust location, materiality and possibly considering a warmer palate, reassessing the window and back of the building design.

The Commission felt façade option 2 addressed the corner and broke down the building into distinct pieces. There is a four story expression facing Broadway and more of a step down along Cutter Street. However, they felt the metal panel was too aggressive and the building reads as more of a commercial building, rather than a residential building. They also felt the frame detailing needed to be modified and more color needed to be integrated.

Following a motion by Member Talun, seconded by Member Valdes, the Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to recommend façade option 2 with additional feedback and guidance incorporated into the design; such as the aluminum materiality, the underdeveloped back of the building, the overall landscaping plan, the location of the windows on the plan, the framing detailing, and how the building relates to the neighborhood.

Following a motion by Member Talun, seconded by Member Valdes, the Commission voted unanimously (4-0) to continue the design review to a future meeting.

RESULT:	CONTINUED
----------------	------------------

NOTICE: These minutes constitute a summary of the votes and key discussions at this meeting. To review a full recording, please contact the Planning, Preservation & Zoning Division at planning@somervillema.gov.